

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In an Office Action dated March 25, 2008, claims 27-38 and 40 were rejected and claim 39 was objected to.

### Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy granted to Applicants' representative in granting a telephonic interview which took place on September 18, 2008. Applicants presented a draft claim amendment substantially in the form as provided herein. The Applicants and Examiner discussed the claim amendment and the DeHaven reference. The Examiner indicated that the amendment would overcome the rejection in the present Office Action based on DeHaven.

### Rejection of Claims 27-37 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, claims 27-37 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,701,666 ("DeHaven") in view of U.S. Patent 6,377,471 ("Chong"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Office Action indicated that the physical structure for "a cartridge" was not disclosed in the claim. Although Applicants believe that the claims distinguish from the references based on the use of the cartridge for the reasons disclosed in Applicants' prior response, Applicants nevertheless have amended claim 27 based on the Office Action's comments to clarify the structure related to the cartridge. As noted above, the Examiner indicated such claim now overcomes the rejection in the Office Action.

Claim 27 sets forth a combination not rendered obvious by the references. For example, instead of teaching the claimed use of a plurality of cartridges, DeHaven teaches a single structure formed with fixtures 90 and 92. Additionally, DeHaven fails to teach the claimed circuitry external to the wafers that measures the power lines in the context of a system as claimed in claim 27. Rather than teaching such external circuitry in a system as claimed in claim 27, DeHaven teaches circuitry 16, which is placed on the wafer. For this additional reason, it is believed that the references fail to render claim 27 obvious. Thus, for the reasons set forth above

it is believed that the rejection of claim 27 has been overcome and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims set forth in the application are believed patentable for at least the reasons as to their parent claims and are also believed independently patentable. Therefore removal of the rejection of dependent claims 28 - 40 is respectfully requested. Applicants also believe that the dependent claims set forth combinations not rendered obvious by the cited references.

Thus, it is believed that the rejection of claims 27 - 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be removed.

**Rejection of Claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, claim 38 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeHaven in view of Chong further in view of U.S. Patent 6,640,323 (“Akram”). Claim 38 was rejected based on reasoning similar to that of claim 27. Such reasoning has been overcome for the reasons discussed above. For this reason alone, the rejection of claim 38 should be removed.

Additionally, Akram fails to render obvious the additional material of claim 38 as set forth in Applicants’ previous response. Therefore, it is believed that the rejection of such claim has also been overcome and removal of the rejection thereof is respectfully requested.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The Office Action indicates that claim 39 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C., second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Such claim has not been amended because it is believed that such claim is in correct form for the reasons set forth above.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including petition fees and extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 23-2415 (Docket No. 1008-743.301).

Respectfully submitted,

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI

Date: 9/19/08

  
George A. Willman, Reg. No. 41,378

650 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
(650) 320-4945  
**Customer No. 021971**